

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/991,287	Applicant(s) STROBEL, RICHARD W.	
	Examiner John J. Zimmerman	Art Unit 1775	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) John J. Zimmerman. (3) Robert W. Strobel.
 (2) Barry L. Kelmachter (Reg. No. 29,999). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 June 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: samp!.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: references applied in Paper No. 5.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The possibility of declarations to show that the hardnesses of the prior art compositions may not meet the hardness limitations of the claims was discussed. In addition, the applicant may submit evidence that the process limitations (e.g. dwell time) may be significant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
 Examiner's signature, if required